



**General Certificate of Education
June 2010**

AS History 1041

HIS1J

Unit 1J

The Development of Germany, 1871–1925

Final

Mark Scheme

Mark schemes are prepared by the Principal Examiner and considered, together with the relevant questions, by a panel of subject teachers. This mark scheme includes any amendments made at the standardisation meeting attended by all examiners and is the scheme which was used by them in this examination. The standardisation meeting ensures that the mark scheme covers the candidates' responses to questions and that every examiner understands and applies it in the same correct way. As preparation for the standardisation meeting each examiner analyses a number of candidates' scripts: alternative answers not already covered by the mark scheme are discussed at the meeting and legislated for. If, after this meeting, examiners encounter unusual answers which have not been discussed at the meeting they are required to refer these to the Principal Examiner.

It must be stressed that a mark scheme is a working document, in many cases further developed and expanded on the basis of candidates' reactions to a particular paper. Assumptions about future mark schemes on the basis of one year's document should be avoided; whilst the guiding principles of assessment remain constant, details will change, depending on the content of a particular examination paper.

Further copies of this Mark Scheme are available to download from the AQA Website: www.aqa.org.uk

Copyright © 2010 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

COPYRIGHT

AQA retains the copyright on all its publications. However, registered centres for AQA are permitted to copy material from this booklet for their own internal use, with the following important exception: AQA cannot give permission to centres to photocopy any material that is acknowledged to a third party even for internal use within the centre.

Set and published by the Assessment and Qualifications Alliance.

Generic Introduction for AS

The AS History specification is based on the assessment objectives laid down in QCA's GCE History subject criteria and published in the AQA specification booklet. These cover the skills, knowledge and understanding which are expected of A Level candidates. Most questions address more than one objective since historical skills, which include knowledge and understanding, are usually deployed together. Consequently, the marking scheme which follows is a 'levels of response' scheme and assesses candidates' historical skills in the context of their knowledge and understanding of History.

The levels of response are a graduated recognition of how candidates have demonstrated their abilities in the Assessment Objectives. Candidates who predominantly address AO1(a) by writing narrative or description will perform at Level 1 or Level 2 depending on its relevance. Candidates who provide more explanation – (AO1(b), supported by the relevant selection of material, AO1(a)) – will perform at high Level 2 or low-mid Level 3 depending on how explicit they are in their response to the question. Candidates who provide explanation with evaluation, judgement and an awareness of historical interpretations will be addressing all 3 AOs (AO1(a); AO1(b); AO2(a) and (b) and will have access to the higher mark ranges. AO2(a) which requires the evaluation of source material is assessed in Unit 2.

Differentiation between Levels 3, 4 and 5 is judged according to the extent to which candidates meet this range of assessment objectives. At Level 3 the answers will show more characteristics of the AO1 objectives, although there should be elements of AO2. At Level 4, AO2 criteria, particularly an understanding of how the past has been interpreted, will be more in evidence and this will be even more dominant at Level 5. The demands on written communication, particularly the organisation of ideas and the use of specialist vocabulary also increase through the various levels so that a candidate performing at the highest AS level is already well prepared for the demands of A2.

CRITERIA FOR MARKING GCE HISTORY:**AS EXAMINATION PAPERS****General Guidance for Examiners (to accompany Level Descriptors)**

Deciding on a level and the award of marks within a level

It is of vital importance that examiners familiarise themselves with the generic mark scheme and apply it consistently, as directed by the Principal Examiner, in order to facilitate comparability across options.

The indicative mark scheme for each paper is designed to illustrate some of the material that candidates might refer to (knowledge) and some of the approaches and ideas they might develop (skills). It is not, however, prescriptive and should only be used to exemplify the generic mark scheme.

When applying the generic mark scheme, examiners will constantly need to exercise judgement to decide which level fits an answer best. Few essays will display all the characteristics of a level, so deciding the most appropriate will always be the first task.

Each level has a range of marks and for an essay which has a strong correlation with the level descriptors the middle mark should be given. However, when an answer has some of the characteristics of the level above or below, or seems stronger or weaker on comparison with many other candidates' responses to the same question, the mark will need to be adjusted up or down.

When deciding on the mark within a level, the following criteria should be considered *in relation to the level descriptors*. Candidates should never be doubly penalised. If a candidate with poor communication skills has been placed in Level 2, he or she should not be moved to the bottom of the level on the basis of the poor quality of written communication. On the other hand, a candidate with similarly poor skills, whose work otherwise matched the criteria for Level 4 should be adjusted downwards within the level.

Criteria for deciding marks within a level:

- The accuracy of factual information
- The level of detail
- The depth and precision displayed
- The quality of links and arguments
- The quality of written communication (grammar, spelling, punctuation and legibility; an appropriate form and style of writing; clear and coherent organisation of ideas, including the use of specialist vocabulary)
- Appropriate references to historical interpretation and debate
- The conclusion

June 2010

GCE AS History Unit 1: Change and Consolidation

HIS1J: The Development of Germany, 1871–1925

Question 1

01 Explain why Bismarck broke with the National Liberals in 1878. (12 marks)

Target: AO1(a), AO1(b)

Generic Mark Scheme

Nothing written worthy of credit. **0**

L1: Answers will contain either some descriptive material which is only loosely linked to the focus of the question or some explicit comment with little, if any, appropriate support. Answers are likely to be generalised and assertive. The response will be limited in development and skills of written communication will be weak. **1-2**

L2: Answers will demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of the demands of the question. They will **either** be almost entirely descriptive with few explicit links to the question **or** they will provide some explanations backed by evidence that is limited in range and/or depth. Answers will be coherent but weakly expressed and/or poorly structured. **3-6**

L3: Answers will demonstrate good understanding of the demands of the question providing relevant explanations backed by appropriately selected information, although this may not be full or comprehensive. Answers will, for the most part, be clearly expressed and show some organisation in the presentation of material. **7-9**

L4: Answers will be well-focused, identifying a range of specific explanations, backed by precise evidence and demonstrating good understanding of the connections and links between events/issues. Answers will, for the most part, be well-written and organised. **10-12**

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and candidates are not obliged to refer to the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels scheme.

Answers should include a range of reasons as to why Bismarck broke with the National Liberals.

Candidates might include some of the following factors:

- since 1873 Germany had been hit by the European wide economic depression. Bismarck was put under pressure for powerful industrial and agricultural interests to protect German goods through the implementation of tariff reform. The National Liberals as free traders opposed this

- the government itself had a motive for breaking with the Liberals and passing protectionist tariffs. Protection would aid the growth of national self-sufficiency and provided the government with a valuable source of income independent of both the Reichstag
- the Kulturkampf, which had been enabled by the alliance with the National Liberals, was unsuccessful in its attempts to break Catholicism. Prussian Junkers were hostile to Catholicism, but they also feared the National Liberals opposition to all religious instruction in schools. The Catholic Centre Party had grown inside the Reichstag and was more likely to support a protectionist economic policy, therefore Bismarck switched allegiance from the National Liberals, to the more conservative Centre Party to push through his tariff reform and satisfy Junker demands
- the National Liberals sealed their own fate by refusing to join Bismarck's cabinet unless they were given guarantees over ministerial appointments and policy decisions.

To reach the higher levels, candidates will need to show the inter-relationship of the reasons given, for example they might argue that the alliance with the National Liberals was one of political convenience for Bismarck as it allowed him to consolidate the Empire and his own position of power within the Reichstag.

Question 1

02 How successful was Bismarck in controlling the Reichstag in the years 1878 to 1890?
(24 marks)

Target: AO1(a), AO1(b), AO2(b)

Generic Mark Scheme

- Nothing written worthy of credit. **0**
- L1:** Answers may either contain some descriptive material which is only loosely linked to the focus of the question or they may address only a part of the question. Alternatively, there may be some explicit comment with little, if any, appropriate support. Answers are likely to be generalised and assertive. There will be little, if any, awareness of differing historical interpretations. The response will be limited in development and skills of written communication will be weak. **1-6**
- L2:** Answers will show some understanding of the focus of the question. They will either be almost entirely descriptive with few explicit links to the question or they may contain some explicit comment with relevant but limited support. They will display limited understanding of differing historical interpretations. Answers will be coherent but weakly expressed and/or poorly structured. **7-11**
- L3:** Answers will show a developed understanding of the demands of the question. They will provide some assessment, backed by relevant and appropriately selected evidence, but they will lack depth and/or balance. There will be some understanding of varying historical interpretations. Answers will, for the most part, be clearly expressed and show some organisation in the presentation of material. **12-16**
- L4:** Answers will show explicit understanding of the demands of the question. They will develop a balanced argument backed by a good range of appropriately selected evidence and a good understanding of historical interpretations. Answers will, for the most part, show organisation and good skills of written communication. **17-21**
- L5:** Answers will be well-focused and closely argued. The arguments will be supported by precisely selected evidence leading to a relevant conclusion/judgement, incorporating well-developed understanding of historical interpretations and debate. Answers will, for the most part, be carefully organised and fluently written, using appropriate vocabulary. **22-24**

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and candidates are not obliged to refer to the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels scheme.

In 'How far' and 'How successful' questions, candidates should be able to make a judgement by balancing points which suggest Bismarck was successful in controlling the Reichstag against others which do not.

Factors suggesting Bismarck was successful might include:

- the alliance of 'steel and rye' successfully upheld conservative authority
- the Anti-Socialist law introduced in 1878 prevented the Socialists from adopting an extreme position as did the introduction of State Socialism
- the Liberals were split and unable threaten his dominance
- the parties in the Reichstag were too divided to form a united front against him
- by manufacturing an artificial political crisis in the wake of the Boulanger affair in France Bismarck managed to tame the Reichstag. In the 1887 elections, the Kartell (German Conservatives, Free Conservatives and National Liberals) won 220 seats, allowing him to push through a new seven year military budget
- he retained the support of Kaiser Wilhelm I which enabled him to override most of the opposition that he faced in the Reichstag.

Factors suggesting Bismarck was not successful might include:

- until 1887 Bismarck had no clear majority in the Reichstag e.g. following the 1881 elections over three-quarters of the Reichstag deputies opposed Bismarck's policies. Bismarck could only rely upon the support of the German Conservatives and Free Conservatives who only controlled 85 seats in the Reichstag; it was only with the support of the Centre that he could scrape by
- in 1881 Bismarck's plans for a tobacco monopoly and proposed increase in indirect taxation were defeated in the Reichstag. It is said that Bismarck often thought of a coup to abolish the Reichstag
- the socialist party grew in numbers despite the anti-socialist law, almost twice as many people voted for them in 1887 as in 1878. 'State Socialism' backfired on Bismarck (indeed it was only passed by the Reichstag in a modified form due to Radical opposition to state subsidies) and by 1890 there were 35 SPD deputies in the Reichstag elected by over 500 000 votes
- the Centre Party used every opportunity to oppose Bismarck in revenge for the Kulturkampf and Windthorst often encouraged his party to voted with the Radicals
- Bismarck's failure to control the Reichstag brought him into conflict with the new Kaiser, Wilhelm II, who used his power to dismiss Bismarck in 1890.

Good answers are likely to (or may) show an awareness that up until 1878 Bismarck's political dominance had depended upon an uneasy alliance with the liberals. Following the break with the liberals in 1878 until 1887 Bismarck did not have clear majority in the Reichstag, therefore making political control of the Reichstag difficult.

Question 2

- 03** Explain why socialism was feared by the right-wing elites in Germany in the years 1890 to 1914. (12 marks)

Target: AO1(a), AO1(b)

Generic Mark Scheme

- Nothing written worthy of credit. **0**
- L1:** Answers will contain either some descriptive material which is only loosely linked to the focus of the question or some explicit comment with little, if any, appropriate support. Answers are likely to be generalised and assertive. The response will be limited in development and skills of written communication will be weak. **1-2**
- L2:** Answers will demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of the demands of the question. They will **either** be almost entirely descriptive with few explicit links to the question **or** they will provide some explanations backed by evidence that is limited in range and/or depth. Answers will be coherent but weakly expressed and/or poorly structured. **3-6**
- L3:** Answers will demonstrate good understanding of the demands of the question providing relevant explanations backed by appropriately selected information, although this may not be full or comprehensive. Answers will, for the most part, be clearly expressed and show some organisation in the presentation of material. **7-9**
- L4:** Answers will be well-focused, identifying a range of specific explanations, backed by precise evidence and demonstrating good understanding of the connections and links between events/issues. Answers will, for the most part, be well-written and organised. **10-12**

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and candidates are not obliged to refer to the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels scheme.

Answers should include a range of reasons as to why socialism was feared by the right wing elites of Germany after 1890.

Candidates might include some of the following factors:

- the German Socialists were strengthened by the years of Bismarckian persecution and liberated by the lapse in the anti-socialist laws in 1890. The SPD organised itself into a nationwide mass party. In 1890 the SPD won 35 seats in the German Reichstag, by 1912 they were by far the largest political party in the Reichstag with a staggering 110 seats. Thus it was difficult to pass legislation in the Reichstag
- at the Erfurt Congress of 1891 the SPD adopted an uncompromising Marxist programme to overthrow the Wilhelmine class system. Therefore the socialists were ideologically committed to the idea of revolution – a fact which frightened the ruling German elites

- the party had mass appeal to the rapidly growing urban working classes who often lived in abject poverty and were increasingly frustrated by the lack of social mobility. Democracy and the power of the masses was feared by the German elites
- strike action was seen by the German elites as harmful to economic progress.

To reach the higher levels, candidates will need to show the inter-relationship of the reasons given, for example they might argue that the primary reason for the increase in the fear of socialism was due to the growth in the SPD following the persecution of the party by Bismarck.

Question 2

- 04** How successful was Kaiser Wilhelm II in developing his personal rule in Germany in the years 1888 to 1914? (24 marks)

Target: AO1(a), AO1(b), AO2(b)

Generic Mark Scheme

- Nothing written worthy of credit. **0**
- L1:** Answers may either contain some descriptive material which is only loosely linked to the focus of the question or they may address only a part of the question. Alternatively, there may be some explicit comment with little, if any, appropriate support. Answers are likely to be generalised and assertive. There will be little, if any, awareness of differing historical interpretations. The response will be limited in development and skills of written communication will be weak. **1-6**
- L2:** Answers will show some understanding of the focus of the question. They will either be almost entirely descriptive with few explicit links to the question or they may contain some explicit comment with relevant but limited support. They will display limited understanding of differing historical interpretations. Answers will be coherent but weakly expressed and/or poorly structured. **7-11**
- L3:** Answers will show a developed understanding of the demands of the question. They will provide some assessment, backed by relevant and appropriately selected evidence, but they will lack depth and/or balance. There will be some understanding of varying historical interpretations. Answers will, for the most part, be clearly expressed and show some organisation in the presentation of material. **12-16**
- L4:** Answers will show explicit understanding of the demands of the question. They will develop a balanced argument backed by a good range of appropriately selected evidence and a good understanding of historical interpretations. Answers will, for the most part, show organisation and good skills of written communication. **17-21**
- L5:** Answers will be well-focused and closely argued. The arguments will be supported by precisely selected evidence leading to a relevant conclusion/judgement, incorporating well-developed understanding of historical interpretations and debate. Answers will, for the most part, be carefully organised and fluently written, using appropriate vocabulary. **22-24**

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and candidates are not obliged to refer to the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels scheme.

In 'How far' and 'How successful' questions, candidates should be able to make a judgement by balancing points which suggest Kaiser Wilhelm was successful in maintaining a personal rule in Germany against others which do not.

Factors suggesting the success of Wilhelm in maintaining a personal rule might include:

- Wilhelm's head of the Civil Cabinet, from 1888–1908, von Luncanus, alongside the Kaiser's best friend, Count Philipp zu Eulenburg, enabled the Kaiser to establish a system of 'personal rule in the 1890s
- Wilhelm controlled all major political and military appointments. He was never reliant on another individual for support
- he appointed three Chancellors after Caprivi, none of whom was able to achieve dominance after Caprivi's resignation, because of the Kaiser's pressure to curb Socialism. Bülow and the elderly Hohenlohe were toadies whom the Kaiser could control, while Bethmann-Hollweg was more interested in foreign policy and was largely excluded from decision-making
- he intervened directly in policy-making, e.g. the naval bills and emphasis on the military and *weltpolitik* were largely of the Kaiser's own making
- he took independent action, ignoring Ministers, e.g. Kruger telegram, 1896; *Daily Telegraph* interview 1908; Zabern Affair, 1913.

Factors suggesting Wilhelm was unsuccessful might include:

- Ministers often acted independently and ignored the Kaiser, who like to go 'on his travels'
- after 1905 Wilhelm became so absorbed in foreign policy that he allowed ministers more control at home over domestic policy
- the Kaiser's power was never absolute. He had to get majorities in the Reichstag (and Prussian Landtag) for legislation
- a result of the Eulenburg scandal and the Daily Telegraph affair was that there were moves within the Reichstag to limit the personal power of the Kaiser
- the Kaiser's own erratic personality may be used as evidence against his ability to create and maintain a 'personal rule'
- despite his influence and concerns, the Socialist Party grew, causing considerable difficulties for the passage of legislation and the raising of taxes (necessary to support an aggressive foreign policy). By 1912 the SPD was the largest party in the Reichstag and represented the growing desire for democracy in Germany, rather than 'fig-leaf democracy'.

Good answers are likely to (or may) show an awareness that between 1897 and 1908 Kaiser Wilhelm dictated policy within Germany to a great extent and it has been claimed that all political appointments, all diplomatic moves and all of the bills in the Reichstag were made on his orders. The Kaiser did not rule, but was rather a powerful and influential figure at the centre of a complicated and chaotic system of government. The Kaiser could wield great power when he believed firmly and consistently in a policy and pursued it to its conclusion: his naval policy is evidence of that. But because of his personality the Kaiser was unable to exploit his prerogatives in such a way that a more able monarch may have been able to.

Question 3

- 05** Explain why the Treaty of Versailles provoked so much opposition to the Weimar Government in 1919. (12 marks)

Target: AO1(a), AO1(b)

Generic Mark Scheme

- Nothing written worthy of credit. **0**
- L1:** Answers will contain either some descriptive material which is only loosely linked to the focus of the question or some explicit comment with little, if any, appropriate support. Answers are likely to be generalised and assertive. The response will be limited in development and skills of written communication will be weak. **1-2**
- L2:** Answers will demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of the demands of the question. They will **either** be almost entirely descriptive with few explicit links to the question **or** they will provide some explanations backed by evidence that is limited in range and/or depth. Answers will be coherent but weakly expressed and/or poorly structured. **3-6**
- L3:** Answers will demonstrate good understanding of the demands of the question providing relevant explanations backed by appropriately selected information, although this may not be full or comprehensive. Answers will, for the most part, be clearly expressed and show some organisation in the presentation of material. **7-9**
- L4:** Answers will be well-focused, identifying a range of specific explanations, backed by precise evidence and demonstrating good understanding of the connections and links between events/issues. Answers will, for the most part, be well-written and organised. **10-12**

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and candidates are not obliged to refer to the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels scheme.

Answers should include a range of reasons as to why the Treaty of Versailles generated so much opposition to the Weimar Government in 1919.

Candidates might include some of the following factors:

- Weimar politicians were accused of being 'November criminals' and of 'stabbing Germany in the back' by signing the hated 'Diktat'. Therefore the Treaty of Versailles made up a crucial element of why right wingers opposed the Republic
- the most universally hated aspect of the Treaty of Versailles was the War Guilt Clause, Article 231, which made Germany liable for all war damages. Nationalists accused Weimar politicians of betraying German interests
- nationalists opposed the Treaty of Versailles because it robbed Germany of many native speakers and did not follow Wilson's 14 Points, one of which was self-determination
- the Treaty generated opposition from the armed forces as the army was cut to 100,000, the navy was radically reduced and the air force was banned

- the Treaty was universally loathed because of its harsh economic sanctions. The Treaty deprived Germany of 75% of iron ore resources, 25% of coal and 15% of arable land.

To reach the higher levels, candidates will need to show the inter-relationship of the reasons given, for example they might conclude that the most important reason why the Treaty of Versailles was the cause of so much opposition was due to the imposition of the War Guilt Clause which led to the loss of land, resources and reparations.

Question 3

- 06** How successful was the Weimar Republic in bringing stability to Germany in the years 1919 to 1925? (24 marks)

Target: AO1(a), AO1(b), AO2(b)

Generic Mark Scheme

- Nothing written worthy of credit. **0**
- L1:** Answers may either contain some descriptive material which is only loosely linked to the focus of the question or they may address only a part of the question. Alternatively, there may be some explicit comment with little, if any, appropriate support. Answers are likely to be generalised and assertive. There will be little, if any, awareness of differing historical interpretations. The response will be limited in development and skills of written communication will be weak. **1-6**
- L2:** Answers will show some understanding of the focus of the question. They will either be almost entirely descriptive with few explicit links to the question or they may contain some explicit comment with relevant but limited support. They will display limited understanding of differing historical interpretations. Answers will be coherent but weakly expressed and/or poorly structured. **7-11**
- L3:** Answers will show a developed understanding of the demands of the question. They will provide some assessment, backed by relevant and appropriately selected evidence, but they will lack depth and/or balance. There will be some understanding of varying historical interpretations. Answers will, for the most part, be clearly expressed and show some organisation in the presentation of material. **12-16**
- L4:** Answers will show explicit understanding of the demands of the question. They will develop a balanced argument backed by a good range of appropriately selected evidence and a good understanding of historical interpretations. Answers will, for the most part, show organisation and good skills of written communication. **17-21**
- L5:** Answers will be well-focused and closely argued. The arguments will be supported by precisely selected evidence leading to a relevant conclusion/judgement, incorporating well-developed understanding of historical interpretations and debate. Answers will, for the most part, be carefully organised and fluently written, using appropriate vocabulary. **22-24**

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and candidates are not obliged to refer to the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels scheme.

In 'How far' and 'How successful' questions, candidates should be able to make a judgement by balancing points which suggest that the Weimar Republic was successful in bring about stability to Germany against others which do not.

Factors suggesting the success of the Weimar Republic in bringing about political stability might include:

- a constitution was established and maintained that provided wide-ranging democratic Governments with a strong centre and limited radicalism. It is largely a myth that Proportional Representation was destabilising for the Republic, the results of the 1919 election were not greatly different from that held in 1912 under the old electoral system
- the governments were responsive to the people and addressed issues such as welfare reform
- political unrest was overcome. Communist rebellion was crushed with the help of the army through the Ebert Groener Pact, the Kapp Putsch was defeated by a workers' strike, and the Munich Putsch was controlled by the prompt action of the Bavarian authorities. After 1923 there were no major coups or political assassinations
- political stability mirrored the economic situation and recovery from late 1923 with a new Currency (the Rentenmark), and the Dawes Plan encouraged greater political contentment and stability. Therefore, Schacht and Stresemann played important roles in bringing political stability to Germany through their management of the 1923 economic crisis
- the role of the President was important. The so called political dualism under President Ebert proved to be a stabilising force during the immediate post-war crises. Ebert made full use of the emergency powers available to him through Article 48 of the constitution to deal with the Kapp and Munich Putsches on the right and the Spartacist, Ruhr and Saxony uprisings on the left. Hindenberg's election as President in 1925 reassured some of the right-wing conservatives and made the regime appear more respectable in their eyes
- Germany's international position aided stability through the policy of fulfilment and the Locarno Pact (October 1925).

Factors suggesting that the Weimar Republic was not successful in bringing about stability might include:

- the problems associated with the Weimar Constitution and proportional representation which meant that governments were coalitions and found protracted agreement difficult.
- some historians argue that the relationship between the two directly elected institutions the Reichstag and the President resulted in the destabilisation of the political system. This was because the President had the power to appoint and dismiss Chancellors and other ministers, dissolve the Reichstag and implement emergency law under Article 48. Therefore there was a political dualism which according to Layton was 'fundamentally ambiguous'
- anti-republican attitudes were prevalent on both the Left and Right as seen in the political unrest of 1919–1923, the activities of the Freikorps and other private armies and the political assassinations e.g. Walter Rathenau
- political stability was heavily dependent on economic stability and there was considerable instability in the immediate aftermath of war and during the period of hyperinflation in 1923
- The invasion of the Rühr strained government stability to breaking point as ministers failed to agree on how to address the situation.

Good answers are likely to (or may) show an awareness that 1923 was a key turning point for the Weimar Republic. Between 1919 and 1923 the Weimar Republic was beset by political instability and crisis but between 1923 and 1925 Germany became increasingly politically and economically stable due to the work of Stresemann and Schacht.